UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/655,828	09/05/2003	Phillip Craig Graves	62941.002015	7150
94551 7590 07/01/2010 LANDMARK INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW, PLLC P.O. BOX 1266			EXAMINER	
			SUBRAMANIAN, NARAYANSWAMY	
MIDLOTHIAN, VA 23113			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3695	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/01/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/655,828	GRAVES ET AL.
Examiner-induced interview Guilliary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Narayanswamy Subramanian	3695
All Participants:	Status of Application: <u>RC</u>	Ε
(1) Narayanswamy Subramanian.	(3)	
(2) Gregory M. Murphy (Reg. No. 52,494).	(4)	
Date of Interview: 29 June 2010	Time: <u>5:00 PM</u>	
Type of Interview:	ant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: 1 and 42		
Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary 	e examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
/Narayanswamy Subramanian/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3695 (A	applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner Subramanian discussed potential 112, second paragraph rejections with the proposed claim 42 and suggested claim language to overcome the rejections. The examiner also indicated that claim 1 may be allowable (subject to updated search) if the limitations of claim 20 are included in claim 1. Similarly inclusion of the features of claim 54 in claim 42 may make the latter claim allowable (subject to updated search). Attorney Murphy agreed to file a response after consulting the inventors.